

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Independent claim 1 is amended above to claim that first ends of first and second fuses have widths substantially the same as those of second ends of the first and second fuses. The amended claims are supported by the specification as filed and are illustrated in the drawings, in particular, Figure 5, which illustrates the elected species in which the first ends of the first and second fuses have widths substantially the same as those of the second ends of the first and second fuses. The amended rejected claims cover the elected species of Figure 5, are supported by Figure 5 and, therefore, are properly presented for examination under the elected species. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The independent claims 7, 11 and 22 are amended to remove the language that refers to respective widths of ends of fuses. The amended claims are supported by the specification as filed and are illustrated in the drawings, in particular, Figure 5, which illustrates the elected species in which widths of ends of some fuses are substantially the same as widths of ends of other fuses. Since the amended rejected claims are silent as to respective widths of ends of fuses, they cover the elected species of Figure 5, are supported by Figure 5 and, therefore, are properly presented for examination under the elected species. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 31 through 33 depend from claims 7, 11 and 22, respectively. They are directed to the embodiment of the invention in which widths of ends of some fuses are substantially the same as widths of ends of other fuses. These features are clearly shown in Figure 5 and described in the specification as filed. Accordingly, they are supported by the original specification and drawings, in particular, Figure 5, which illustrates the elected species. Accordingly, the new dependent claims read on the elected species and are properly presented in the application for examination.

Notwithstanding the above comments and the amendments to the claims, the applicants

Application Number 10/672,035
Amendment dated May 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005


submit that the claims as originally filed were supported by the original disclosure, including Figure 5 of the elected species. Furthermore, the original claims were directed to the elected invention of Figure 5. The original claims as written recited "narrower than or identical to." Figure 5 clearly shows the alternative "identical to." Therefore, the claims prior to the present amendments were supported by the illustration of Figure 5 and read on the elected species of Figure 5.

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 22 is amended above to correct the language pointed out in the Office Action. In view of the amendments, it is believed that the rejections are overcome, and reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully solicited. If a telephone conference will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/26/05
Mills & Onello, LLP
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 994-4900
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774
J:\SAM\0489\amenda\amendment3a.wpd


Steven M. Mills
Registration Number 36,610
Attorney for Applicants